

Wisconsin Program Enhancement Plan

Progress Report for Quarter 5

November 2005 – January 2006

Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services

Division of Children and Family Services

Submitted March 1, 2006

To:

Federal Administration for Children and Families

Wisconsin PEP Progress Report for Quarter 5

Contents

	Page
List of Attachments	2
Introduction	3
PEP Implementation Team Activities	4
General PEP Updates	6
Continuous Quality Improvement Program	8
Quarter 5 Accomplishments/Quarter 6 Planned Activities	11
PEP Data Update	24
Performance Chart for National Standards (Table 1)	26
Performance Chart for CFSR Items (Table 2)	29
Performance Chart for CPS Investigation Timeliness (Table 3)	33
Changes to PEP Matrix	34

Attachments to PEP Quarter 5 Report:

1. 11/1/2005 PEP Implementation Team Meeting Agenda
2. DCFS Memo 2005-14 on Access Standard
3. Access Standard and Appendices
4. DRAFT Maltreatment and Maltreater Determinations
5. DRAFT Safety Intervention Standards and Appendices
6. DRAFT DCFS Memo on Trial Home Visits
7. DRAFT Trial Home Visit Policy
8. Placement Stability and Re-entry Analysis
9. eWiSACWIS Operations Memo 2006-01
10. DCFS Info Memo 2005-13 on Permanency Review Panels
11. A Guide for Permanency Plan Administrative Review Panel Members
12. DCFS Info Memo 2006-01 on Placement of Siblings in Out-of-Home Care and Adoption
13. DRAFT DCFS Memo on Change to Ch. HFS 56, Adm. Code
14. DRAFT Language for Ch. HFS 56 Regarding Number of Children in a Foster Home
15. DRAFT DCFS Memo on Number of Children in a Foster Home
16. DRAFT DCFS Memo on Revised Family Interaction Policy
17. DRAFT Revised Family Interaction Policy
18. DCFS Memo 2006-01 on ICWA Notification
19. Identification of Indian Children and Proper Notification.
20. DRAFT Policy on Sharing Information with Relatives and Potential Caregivers
21. Resource List for Identifying Fathers and Relatives
22. Caseworker and Parent/Family Face-to-Face Contact Policy
23. Q & A Document re: Face-to-Face Contact Policy
24. DRAFT DCFS Info Memo on Foster Parent Support Plans
25. DRAFT Information for Foster Parents, Part B Form
26. DRAFT Report on Foster Parent Training
27. Issue Paper on Mental Health Screening
28. DCFS Info Memo 2005-12 on Concurrent Planning Timeline
29. Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline
30. DRAFT DCFS Memo on Opportunity to Present Information at Permanency Plan Reviews and Court Hearings
31. DRAFT Format for Foster Parent/Custodian Input to the Court
32. Statement of Scope for Ch. HFS 43, Adm. Code on Training Requirements
33. DRAFT DCFS Memo on Service Array Survey
34. DRAFT Service Array Survey Questions and Service Descriptions
35. Design Guide for Permanency Planning Detail PEP Report
36. DCFS Info Memo 2006-06 on PEP Data Entry Requirements

Introduction

This progress report describes Program Enhancement Plan (PEP) implementation activities completed during November 1, 2005 through January 31, 2006, which is the fifth quarter of the two-year PEP period. The report also describes planned activities that will occur during the sixth quarter of February 1, 2006 through April 30, 2006. Since PEP action steps have benchmark tasks occurring in successive quarters, the narrative for most items covers both the accomplishments in the most recent quarter and planned activities in the next quarter.

The PEP is administered by the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS), the state child welfare agency within the Wisconsin Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS). The PEP is being implemented with the cooperation and participation of county and tribal child welfare agencies and other stakeholders on the PEP Implementation Team.

The progress report refers to Action Steps in the PEP, as approved by the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF), to respond to the findings of the federal Child and Family Services Review (CFSR) of Wisconsin. The Action Steps are described in the Matrix portion of the PEP. An updated PEP Matrix reflecting changes for Quarter 5 is attached to this progress report.

The complete PEP Narrative and Matrix and information about the PEP process are available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP.htm>

PEP Contact Person:

John Tuohy, Planning Director
Division of Children and Family Services
1 W. Wilson Street, Room 550
Madison, WI 53708-8916
Phone 608-267-3832
Fax 608-266-6836
Email <mailto:mtuohyjo@dhfs.state.wi.us>

PEP Implementation Team Activities

The PEP Implementation Team was formed in August 2004 and the first meeting was held on November 29, 2004. The Implementation Team was created as a collaborative, cross-systems approach to guide planning and implementation of child welfare practice and policy in order to achieve the federal performance outcomes and enhance services to Wisconsin's children and families. The Implementation Team is comprised of over 80 individuals representing a wide array of diverse fields, including domestic abuse, schools, law enforcement, juvenile justice, state courts, health care, mental health, substance abuse, and child protective services. In addition, the Implementation Team has representation from foster and adoptive parents, tribes, advocacy groups and state legislators.

The PEP Implementation Team held its fifth meeting on November 1, 2005 (see attached agenda). The November meeting included discussion of PEP committee reports, Quarter 4 accomplishments, state performance on national safety and permanency standards, state and federal child welfare program updates, and a discussion on how to increase participation at meetings by non-county stakeholders. The next Implementation Team meeting will take place on February 23, 2006. The Implementation Team meetings are held quarterly and broadcast on the Internet to allow remote participation. Information about the Implementation Team is available at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/PEP-Team/pepTeam.htm>

The PEP Implementation Team utilizes five PEP committees to help shape the policies, procedures, and practices needed to complete the twenty (20) Action Steps identified in the Wisconsin PEP. The Executive Committee held its first meeting in February 2005 and meets quarterly to set agendas for full Implementation Team meetings. The other PEP committees held their first meetings in January or February 2005 and met at least monthly during calendar year (CY) 2005. The PEP committees and their respective responsibilities are as follows:

- **PEP Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee of the full PEP Implementation Team meets between the PEP Implementation Team meetings to assist DCFS in creating long-term goals and strategies for the PEP Implementation Team, including the development of the agendas for the quarterly meetings.

- **Child Welfare Case Process**

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee clarifies and develops policies and guidelines for standards of practice related to Access/Intake, Initial Assessment, and Ongoing Services. In addition, this Committee addresses issues related to domestic violence and other child welfare associated programs and service systems.

- **Out-of-Home Care**

The Out-of-Home Care Committee enhances policies, practices, and procedures related to Out-of-Home Placement, Title IV-E, Permanency Planning, Independent Living, Kinship Care, and the Interstate Compact on the Placement of Children (ICPC).

- **Adoption Services**

The Adoption Services Committee develops and updates policies, practices, and procedures related to Concurrent Permanency Planning, Termination of Parental Rights (TPR), Adoption, Adoption Search, and Adoption Assistance payments.

- **Continuous Quality Improvement**

The Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) Committee designs and implements a county review process including an on-site review process and identifies the management and program information needs of counties and tribes for child welfare data reports.

In addition, for PEP Action Steps and other policy issues that involve tribal child welfare or child welfare staff and provider training, the existing Indian Child Welfare Coordination Group and State Training Council are consulted by the PEP Implementation Team for expertise and guidance. Training updates are provided at PEP Implementation Team meetings.

To facilitate public input on policies and procedures related to PEP action steps, DCFS created the PEP Bulletin Board for materials developed by PEP committees to be available for public comment. The availability of the Bulletin Board has been publicized to counties, tribes and other key stakeholders. The Bulletin Board can be accessed at:

<http://dhfs.wisconsin.gov/cwreview/bulletinBrd.htm>

General PEP Updates

Updates to PEP Performance Item Baselines

During Quarter 5, Wisconsin reached agreement with the federal ACF to update the baseline performance levels for the PEP. Wisconsin was determined to be in non-conformance for 19 of the 23 safety, permanency and well-being outcome items based on the August 2003 CFSR case review process. Performance for 5 of the 19 items is based on statewide foster care data submitted for federal Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS) purposes or statewide child safety data equivalent to the data submitted for federal National Child Abuse and Neglect Data System (NCANDS) purposes. Performance for 13 of the 19 items will be measured using results from the state Quality Service Review (QSR) case review process. Performance for the remaining item is based on statewide data from the eWiSACWIS child welfare information system.

The performance baselines for the 13 items using case review results were adjusted to reflect limited case reviews conducted in three counties during the Summer of 2005 to provide additional case review results reflecting small to mid-size counties. The performance baseline for the item using statewide eWiSACWIS data was established using data from time periods comparable to PEP Quarters 1 and 2. The adjusted performance baselines were approved by ACF in January 2006.

The Wisconsin approach of using QSR scores and methodology for conversion to CFSR equivalent scores were approved by ACF in February 2006. The QSR case scores range from 1 to 6 and for CFSR purposes a score of 4 or higher is necessary for the case to be rated a strength. The QSR case review tool includes additional data to address CFSR items that are not directly addressed by the QSR case review tool. Wisconsin will continue to analyze how the QSR scores match up with the CFSR items and make adjustments to either the methodology or the QSR case review tool as necessary to ensure the QSR scores can be accurately used for CFSR purposes.

State Performance

The state performance on the national standard items is shown in Table 1 in the data section of the report. The information included in the table is the same as the Quarter 4 report. The DCFS is seeking updated federal AFCARS files for the federal fiscal year (FFY) 2005 period, including the FFY 2005 "A/B" file and the "C" file, for the permanency national standards.. For the child safety national standards, DCFS is finalizing the state CY 2005 child safety data. Updated information will be included in the Quarter 6 report.

The state performance on the 19 CFSR items with improvement targets is shown in Table 2 in the data section of the report. Scores from the county reviews conducted through the end of Quarter 5 are included using the agreed-upon methodology for converting QSR case scores to CFSR equivalent scores. The performance information will continue to be updated in future reports as more county reviews are completed.

Renegotiation of PEP Action Steps

Linda Mitchell and Krista Thomas of the federal ACF met with DCFS, Director of State Courts Office county and training partnership representatives on January 9-10, 2006 to discuss PEP implementation. During the ACF staff visit, the DCFS was notified of the opportunity to renegotiate timeframes for completion of certain PEP items. The ACF staff noted the progress of PEP implementation thus far and the county concerns about the difficulty of keeping up with the pace of implementation. For PEP Action Steps related to child safety and systemic factors, it is essential that Wisconsin complete the tasks currently specified in the PEP. For other tasks related to permanency and well being, the ACF staff indicated the DCFS can propose revised implementation dates beyond the October 31, 2006 end date of the PEP. Any tasks delayed beyond the end date of the PEP must be included in the Wisconsin Child and Family Services Plan. The renegotiated tasks approved by the ACF will be included in the state plan for FFY 2007, which is due to ACF by June 30, 2006.

The DCFS will consult with county agencies and other stakeholders on options for renegotiation of PEP tasks. A list of tasks was distributed by DCFS for comment on February 17, 2006 and the list will be discussed with the Children and Families Policy Advisory Committee of the Wisconsin County Human Services Association (WCHSA) on February 22, 2006 and the PEP Implementation Team on February 23, 2006. Based on the county and stakeholder feedback, the list of renegotiation tasks with revised completion dates and rationales for the extensions will be submitted by the DCFS to the ACF by early March 2006. Once approved, the DCFS will submit a revised PEP Matrix reflecting the renegotiation tasks.

Note: The DCFS has already requested and received ACF approval for renegotiation of the proposed revision of the *Child Protective Services Ongoing Service Standards and Practice Guidelines*, as shown in Action Steps J.1 and N.1 of the PEP.

For the Quarter 5 report, the PEP Matrix is updated to reflect routine changes to particular benchmark tasks, as has been done in previous quarterly reports. The changes to the Matrix are noted in this report.

Continuous Quality Improvement Program

This section of the report addresses activities of the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) program within the DCFS, including implementation of the Quality Service Review (QSR) case review protocol with counties and other activities to ensure compliance with federal program requirements. References to PEP Action Steps in parentheses are to the specific Action Steps in the PEP Matrix.

1. County QSR Reviews

The official system of CQI county child welfare program reviews using the QSR review protocol began in Quarter 5 as scheduled in the PEP Matrix. Rock County volunteered to be first and their review took place the week of October 31, 2005. This was followed by a review of Waukesha County during the week of December 5, 2005 and Iowa County during the week of January 23, 2006. In each county, 10 to 12 cases were reviewed with a mix of placement and in-home service cases. In addition to the case reviews, the CQI Team conducted stakeholder focus groups in each of the counties. The Children's Court Initiative (CCI) also conducted case file reviews and stakeholder interviews to evaluate judicial performance during the QSR reviews.

For performance measurement purposes, scores from the 32 cases in the three counties are included in Table 2 in the data section. In addition, the scores from 12 cases reviewed in Washington County the week of September 26, 2006 are also included. While Washington County was one of the pilots for the QSR, the QSR review tool was substantially completed at that point, so the cases are being included to provide additional data for CFSR performance measurement purposes.

Upcoming county reviews in Quarter 6 include St. Croix, Dane, and Sheboygan. In addition the DCFS plans to have Ray Foster, Director of Human Systems and Outcomes (HSO), train another group of 30 persons as "Shadow 2" reviewers in March 2006, many of whom DCFS hopes will become certified as lead case reviewers. Increasing the number of lead reviewers is important to supporting the CQI Specialists on an ongoing basis for future reviews.

2. Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) (Q.3.8)

During Quarter 5, the CQI County Review system was officially rolled out using the QSR protocol for conducting county reviews. A team of 15 persons began a CQI review in Rock County on October 31, 2005 and completed the review on November 4, 2005. A total of 85 persons were interviewed within the 10 cases selected for review. A total of 67 persons participated in the 12 focus groups.

On December 5, 2005 a team of 16 reviewers and Ray Foster of HSO began a CQI review of Waukesha County's child welfare system. A total of 94 persons were interviewed within the 12 cases selected for review. A total of 75 persons participated in the 11 focus groups.

On January 23, 2006 a team of 13 reviewers began a CQI review of Iowa County's child welfare system. A total of 75 persons were interviewed with the 10 cases selected for review. A total of 38 persons participated in the 9 focus groups.

3. ICWA Monitoring (G.3)

The manager of the CQI program met with the 11 tribes on February 2, 2006 to give a power point presentation on the CQI review system, explaining how reviews are done and identify possible roles for tribes. The tribes may provide staff to participate in future reviews in those counties with a significant tribal population.

4. Children's Court Initiative (O.6)

In the aforementioned reviews, the Children's Court Initiative (CCI) conducted a simultaneous review of the judicial systems in the respective counties. The CQI site leaders and CCI staff conducted many joint focus groups to gather stakeholder opinions about the strengths of and identifying opportunities for improving outcomes in both the county child welfare and judicial systems. CQI and CCI jointly conduct the following focus groups in each county: caseworkers, supervisors/managers, guardians ad litem, corporation counsel/district attorneys, foster parents and judges. This joint focus groups are particularly beneficial to gather stakeholder opinions about the strengths of and identifying opportunities for improving outcomes in the county child welfare and court systems. Whenever possible, county CQI and CCI review activities will continue to be combined to reduce duplication and minimize disruption to the county.

5. BMCW Comprehensive Review Process (Q.4)

Review activities for the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare (BMCW) Comprehensive Review began in September 2005 and will be completed in January 2006. Discussions between the DCFS Office of Program Evaluation and Planning (OPEP) and BMCW staff during Quarter 4 resulted in the modification of the case review instrument used for the evaluation of Ongoing Case Management services to record specific data elements on the cases reviewed and to elicit comments and analysis from the reviewers which would allow the findings to be compared to those generated from the CFSR case review instrument.

The complete report on the BMCW Comprehensive Review will be released on March 20, 2006. The BMCW case results will be tabulated and included in the next PEP Progress Report along with QSR case review scores. After the public release of the report, the specific results for each Region will be presented to the program providers. From that report and the settlement statistical report, the program providers are expected to create corrective action plans.

On March 1, 2006, Paul Vincent of the Child Welfare Program and Policy Group will make a presentation in Milwaukee on options for incorporating the QSR review protocol into the BMCW case review process. The BMCW will work with the Milwaukee Partnership Council, OPEP and the CQI Team to determine how the BMCW case review process should be adapted. Portions of the BMCW case review process that are not included in the QSR protocol, such as reviewing child protective service (CPS) Intake and Initial Assessment and Foster Home Licensing, may be considered by the PEP CQI Committee for possible use statewide.

6. Develop QA Reviewers (Q.5)

The initial two-day training of QSR case reviewers was conducted in October 2005. The attendees were awarded continuing education hours (CEHs) for their time. Twelve persons from the group of 30 who were trained participated as “Shadow 2” QSR case reviewers in the Rock, Waukesha and Iowa County reviews. Shadow 2 case reviewers went through the two-day training with the understanding they must commit to participate in two weeklong reviews within the year following their training. Five of the 12 persons have currently been certified as lead case reviewers, thereby becoming eligible to be compensated for their time in future reviews.

During the week of March 20, 2006, a second two-day QSR training will be conducted by Ray Foster of HSO. Mr. Foster trained the first group of 30 experienced child welfare workers and in the next group of 30 the DCFS has targeted retired workers who have expressed an interest on becoming certified reviewers and participating in multiple reviews. Based on the federal CFSR state review experience and QSR efforts in other states, it is clear that compensating experienced reviewers is an essential component in attracting and retaining them for multiple reviews, thereby assuring consistency and integrity in the review system.

Quarter 5 Accomplishments and Quarter 6 Planned Activities

The following is a summary of the activities completed during the PEP Quarter 5 period of November 1, 2005 to January 31, 2006 and activities planned for the PEP Quarter 6 period of February 1, 2006 through April 30, 2006. References to PEP Action Steps in parentheses are to the specific Action Steps in the PEP Matrix.

1. Access Standard (A.1)

The Access Standard and Appendices were issued by DCFS Numbered Memo 2005-14 on November 9, 2005 (see attachments). The Access Standard takes effect on March 31, 2006 when changes in eWiSACWIS necessary to support implementation of the standard will be complete. The Access Standard provides more clarity and direction to CPS staff around gathering and documenting information collected when a report of alleged child maltreatment is received and in making the screening and response time decisions.

Roundtable trainings were held statewide in each region during Quarter 5 to provide a forum for CPS Supervisors to discuss ways to implement the Access Standard. The Wisconsin Child Welfare Training System has developed the pre-service and foundation Access training to be provided to workers and supervisors throughout the state. The pilot trainings were done in September and November and the statewide training began in January 2006.

The process to change the Access Report (i.e. intake) in the eWiSACWIS system begun in August 2005 by establishing a series of meetings with the eWiSACWIS design team to conceptualize the enhancements needed to support the Access Standard. Subsequently, a series of specific design sessions took place, with the opportunity for extensive county input provided via webcast technology. The system change will be completed March 31, 2006. The enhancement will allow workers to use one document to gather information at the first point of contact. The supervisor will then have the ability to assign the assessment process most suitable for the Access Report (e.g. CPS assessment, offer of voluntary services, etc.).

2. Multiple Reports and Allegations (A.2.)

One of the policies that guides CPS practice statewide is the policy on determining case findings. Case finding determinations are the decisions at the completion of an investigation/initial assessment as to whether abuse or neglect has occurred and, in some cases, whether a specific person has been determined to be the maltreater.

The Child Welfare Case Process Committee, comprised of county, tribal, state and private agency representatives, reviewed and made recommendations for revising the policy with the following goals in mind: greater accuracy and consistency in how the determinations are made. The case finding determinations policy, entitled "Maltreatment and Maltreater Determinations" (see attachment) was completed by the committee in January 2006, posted on the PEP Bulletin Board for statewide comment, and discussed informally at regional CPS supervisor meetings. The policy is currently under final review within the DCFS. Regional roundtable trainings will take place after the policy is finalized and issued.

In developing the policy, the committee determined that recommended changes in the case finding policy should be implemented in conjunction with changes in the interviewing requirements in the CPS Investigation Standards, specifically those standards that address maltreatment by non-family and non-household members. Therefore, the committee also accepted the responsibility to revise the CPS Investigation Standards for non-family cases. The revisions to the CPS Investigation Standards will be reviewed by the committee in March 2006 before being posted on the PEP Bulletin Board for statewide review and discussion.

Initial meetings with the eWiSACWIS design team and two design sessions have taken place to identify the changes needed in eWiSACWIS to implement the revisions to the case finding policy. Two more design sessions are scheduled. The eWiSACWIS changes are scheduled for completion at the end of June 2006.

3. Safety Assessment and Planning (B.1)

In December 2005, the Child Welfare Case Process Committee completed the draft Safety Intervention Standards. The Safety Intervention Standards and Appendices (see attachment) were posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for public review and comment in Quarter 5 and the documents have been forwarded to DCFS for final review. The Standards will provide more clarity and direction to CPS staff around safety intervention and management of cases throughout the CPS case process. In addition, the Standards provide direction to staff related to parent involvement in the safety planning process, assessing and understanding a parent's protective capacities, and providing services and supports that enhances the parent's protective role.

The Safety Intervention Standards and associated appendices will be forwarded to the Wisconsin County Human Services Association for review and comment in February 2006. The Standards will be issued in March 2006 with a June 2006 effective date. Training will be provided in regional roundtables in Quarter 6 and the first part of Quarter 7 to support implementation of the Standards in June 2006. State, county, and BMCW staff are currently involved in eWiSACWIS design sessions to make system changes necessary to support implementation of the Standards.

4. Trial Home Visit Policy (C.1.b)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee, and specifically the Permanency Planning and the Birth Family Involvement workgroups, developed a revised draft of the Trial Home Visit policy. In addition, the Out-of-Home Care Committee and the Child Welfare Case Process Committee met jointly in January for an all-day meeting to discuss further revisions. By the end of Quarter 5, the revised draft policy (see attachment) was posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for comment. The comments from the Bulletin Board will be used to further develop and refine the policy.

During Quarter 6, Bureau of Programs and Policies (BPP) staff will continue to revise the policy. The revised policy will be posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for a second time. BPP staff will also work with eWiSACWIS project team members to identify how and where to document a trial home visit in the automated system and initiate necessary changes.

5. Re-entry and Placement Stability (C.1.a and C.2.a)

A full analysis of the Targeted Case Review results was completed by OPEP staff in December 2005 (see attachment). The analysis was shared with the directors of the participating county agencies, the Out-of-Home Care Committee, BPP policy development staff, and other key stakeholder groups in Quarter 5. The following key findings were presented to the Out-of-Home Care Committee in January 2006 for further consideration:

- The majority of cases for both the stability and re-entry samples included children over the age of 10 years old; and in the re-entry sample children 15-18 years old constituted almost 70% of the sample. Efforts to improve stability and reduce re-entry should focus on older children.
- Both the stability and re-entry results indicate significant impacts associated with the use of shelter and detention facilities as out-of-home placements. This effect was most pronounced for re-entry cases that had the highest proportion of Juvenile Justice case types and older children. Additional guidance is needed on how to document shelter and detention use in eWiSACWIS.
- For placement re-entry, the majority of children were open with the local agency under a court order (most frequently juvenile justice) at the time of re-entry and the majority of children did not receive or did not have documentation indicating the receipt of post-reunification services. The effect of post-reunification services including continued supervision of cases upon return should be analyzed along with the impact of the proposed Trial Home Visit Policy.
- For placement stability, further study is needed on the use of receiving homes for the initial placement following removal to allow for selection of a long-term placement provider. Approximately 16% of the cases in the sample had multiple receiving home settings.
- Given the significant variation in the use of case types, placement settings and discharge values, there is a need to improve data quality. It is recommended that additional training and technical assistance be given and system changes be made to improve the data entry in these areas.

6. Placement Manual (C.3)

The *eWiSACWIS Placement Documentation Manual*, originally issued in January 2005, was updated in January 2006 to provide additional direction on the use of shelter and detention placements. Based on the results of the Targeted Case Review conducted on factors affecting placement re-entry and stability rates, the manual was updated to provide guidance on how and when to document detention and shelter placements as in-home services for children who are not in court-ordered out-of-home care (generally juvenile delinquency cases) and how to use those settings for children already in out-of-home care. The manual update was issued via DCFS eWiSACWIS Operations Memo 2006-01 (see attachment) and specifies when the use of shelter or secure detention facilities constitutes an out-of-home placement, consistent with AFCARS and Title IV-E requirements. The manual update will lead to improved documentation of placements and in-home services in eWiSACWIS to support data consistency from county to county.

In addition to the placement manual update, the DCFS has provided consultation to county agencies, BMCW, and state regional staff to support implementation of the new data entry requirements. This consultation has included development of a webcast regarding the manual update and corresponding technical changes in eWiSACWIS, individualized technical assistance to

counties and their assigned state regional staff where shelter and secure detention facilities are used most frequently, and participation in regional meetings with county program and fiscal staff.

7. Permanency Planning Procedures (D.3)

Permanency Plan Reviews. During Quarter 5, the Out-of-Home Care Committee finalized informational materials for permanency plan panel members in a booklet entitled “A Guide for Permanency Plan Administrative Review Panel Members.” The booklet was issued via DCFS Information Memo 2005-13 on December 7, 2005 (see attachment).

During Quarter 6, the booklet will be published and made available on the internet for downloading, which will allow agencies who have additional information for their reviewers to tailor the booklet as they see fit. Once published, the booklet can be ordered in hard copy through the DHFS Publication Center.

Training on Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning. The BPP is working with the Director of State Courts Office to develop further training and facilitate discussions between judges and county directors regarding permanency planning and other changes arising out of the PEP. The training and discussions will occur in Spring 2006 at Judicial District meetings.

8. Foster and Adoptive Family Assessments (D.5)

The Adoption Services Committee continued its discussions regarding the most appropriate format for combining the Foster Family Assessment (FFA) and Adoption Family Assessment (AFA). On February 22 and 23, 2006, a representative from SAFE will present to home study workers, the Adoption Services Committee, and the PEP Implementation Team on the SAFE home study format. The BPP anticipates a final decision in Quarter 6 with implementation in Quarters 7 and 8 for state adoption staff. The timing implementation of the assessment in eWiSACWIS will depend on the availability of resources to complete the work. In the interim, the combined home study format would be available as a stand alone fillable document.

9. Sibling Placement (E.1 and E.2)

The DCFS issued Informational Memo 2006-01 “*Placement of Siblings in Out-of-Home Care and Adoption*” (see attachment) on January 17, 2006 that emphasizes the importance of maintaining sibling connections, assists agencies in documenting sibling placement or separation, discusses valid reasons for separating siblings in out-of-home care settings, and provides information about applying the foster care exceptional rate for sibling groups.

10. Number of Children in Foster Homes (E.3)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee has approved a proposed language change to Ch. HFS 56, Adm. Code (see attachment), to allow licensing agencies to grant exceptions for the placement of more than 6 but no more than 8 foster children in a foster home. The proposed language change will also allow an agency to apply to the Department Exceptions Panel if the agency determines that placement of more than 8 children in a foster home is necessary and appropriate. Agencies

will be required to follow existing requirements for the review, approval, and documentation of exceptions to licensing standards.

In addition, the committee has reviewed a draft memo (see attachment) to be issued when the language change to Ch. HFS 56, Adm. Code, is implemented that explains in more detail the ability to grant an exception, the parameters of the exception, factors to evaluate when considering this exception, and other staff or agencies to consider including in the decision to grant an exception to allow more than 6 foster children in a foster home. The timing for issuing the memo will depend on when the rule change can be made. This language change would only apply to non-treatment foster homes licensed under Ch. HFS 56, Adm. Code, and would not apply to treatment providers.

11. Family Interaction Policy (F.1.a)

During Quarter 5, BPP staff worked with the Bureau of Regulation and Licensing (BRL) to communicate this new policy to out-of-home care providers and to answer any questions or concerns. Specifically, BPP staff attended a joint BRL/BPP meeting consisting of Licensing Specialists and Chiefs, Adoption Supervisors, and Child Welfare Program specialists. In addition, BPP staff attended the statewide Foster Care Coordinators meeting in December 2005 to communicate this policy to county and private agency staff. BPP also provided agencies and out-of-home care providers with a Q & A document as a reference.

During regional roundtables held in Quarters 4 and 5, agencies expressed concern regarding several aspects of the policy, including how to document the family interaction plan in case notes and in the comments section of the Safety Assessment. As a result, certain provisions of the policy were reconsidered by the Child Welfare Case Process Committee to give agencies more flexibility in documentation. The DCFS has prepared a revised numbered memo to make the changes recommended by the committee. The revised policy memo will be issued in Quarter 6. When the new policy is issued, recipients will include child placing agencies, group homes, residential care centers, and shelter care facilities to assure that out-of-home care providers are informed.

Also during Quarter 5, the Family Interaction Policy was incorporated into foundation training for caseworkers. Specifically, the policy was incorporated into the training course on Separation, Placement, and Reunification. With regard to foster parents and county foster care staff, the policy has been incorporated into the forthcoming Foster Parent Handbook and, in Quarter 6, will also be included in the foster parent training curriculum, which is currently being revised by BPP and Training Partnership staff.

12. Tribal Child Welfare (F.2 and G.1)

The DCFS issued Memo 2006-01 on January 17, 2006 providing direction for notification of tribes under the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) when Indian children are placed in out-of-home care (see attachment). The memo and attached policy describe the process for counties to notify tribes using the templates previously included in the eWiSACWIS system.

DCFS has continued to meet on a bimonthly basis with the child welfare directors and staff of all 11 federally-recognized tribes in Wisconsin and has been implementing various pieces of the seven tribal priorities.

The DCFS has requested legislation be drafted to codify the federal ICWA requirements into state statute, which is one of the tribal priorities. The DCFS is currently waiting for a draft from the Legislative Reference Bureau that will then be shared with tribes, counties and courts for comment. Depending on when the draft is ready, it may be introduced for consideration in the current legislative session. However, since there is limited time remaining in the 2006 legislative session, DCFS may seek consideration of the legislation in the 2007 legislative session.

The DCFS has recently established a workgroup to examine the need to update or otherwise revise the content and purpose of 161 Agreements to assure that services to Indian children are being provided in an appropriate manner by the county and tribal agency. In addition, DCFS staff, in conjunction with DHFS Tribal Affairs Office staff, have met with managers and leaders of several counties and tribes to develop agreements related to responsibility in the broader area of child welfare. These counties and tribes include: Sauk County and the Ho-Chunk Nation; Bayfield County and the Red Cliff Band; and Forest County with the Potawatomi Community and the Sakoagon Tribe.

The DCFS is continuing to work with the Inter-Tribal Child Welfare Training Partnership in the development of an ICWA training curriculum and the provision of services to Indian children and their families. A workgroup of state, county, and tribal representatives has recently met to review a draft training curriculum, which should be approved during Quarter 6.

The DCFS has recently undertaken an effort to examine the cost of the out-of-home placement of tribal children placed by either the circuit court or the tribal court. The DCFS has also examined Title IV-E agreements between other states and the tribes located in those states.

13. Identifying and Engaging Relatives and Non-Custodial Parents (H.1 and I.1)

The Birth Family Involvement workgroup of the Out-of-Home Care Committee has completed a review of statutory and policy barriers to identifying and engaging relatives and non-custodial parents and has begun to compile a list of tools that will help to identify and locate relatives and non-custodial parents. A draft proposed guide (see attachment) that will cover both relatives and non-custodial parents will be presented to the Birth Family Involvement workgroup in Quarter 6 and work will continue in Quarters 6 and 7.

14. Policy on Sharing Information with Relatives and Potential Caregivers (H.2)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee has completed work on a policy document explaining what information can be shared with relatives and other potential caregivers (see attached). However, the DCFS successfully inserted language into Wisconsin Senate Bill 284 that would change current law to expand the type of information agency staff could provide to relatives. SB 284 has been approved by the State Senate and is currently pending in the State Assembly. The policy document

on information sharing will be issued in Quarter 7 to reflect either current law, or the revised law should SB 284 be enacted.

15. Relative Placement Survey (H.4)

The survey has been completed and initial results were provided to the Out-of-Home Care Committee. Further analysis will be done in Quarter 6 and provided to the Birth Family Involvement workgroup of the committee to be considered in developing the guidance on engaging relatives and non-custodial parents under Items H.1 and I.1.

16. Family Assessment and Case Planning (J.1.b)

Based on recommendations of the Child Welfare Case Process Committee, the DCFS is modifying the family assessment, case plan, and case progress evaluation documents in eWiSACWIS. State, county, and BMCW staff are currently involved in design sessions to make necessary changes to support practice requirements of the Safety Intervention Standards as well as an integrated approach to CPS intervention related to the assessment and planning process. The changes in eWiSACWIS are scheduled for implementation in June 2006.

The DCFS continues to support a workgroup of county, Area Administration and other state staff that is looking at long range consolidation of various case plan documents in the system.

17. Barriers to Engagement (J.3.b and c)

During Quarter 5, BPP staff met with the Child Welfare Training Partnership to revise training courses to enhance the engagement skills of caseworkers. BPP will continue to work with the Training Partnership during Quarter 6 to revise training courses. The training system is planning to pilot a stand-alone skills training on engaging families and motivational interviewing. The training would be open to both initial assessment and ongoing workers. It will be piloted in the Northeastern Region of the state, and if it proves to be effective in helping with family engagement, the course will be offered throughout the state.

During Quarter 6, BPP and Training Partnership staff will provide training and technical assistance to child welfare supervisors on removing barriers to family engagement and revise the Core Training Curriculum to include methodologies for establishing and maintaining family engagement.

18. Caseworker and Parent/Family Face-to-Face Contact Policy (J.4)

The BPP staff provided technical assistance and training to CPS Supervisors, including BMCW, through regional roundtables so that the Supervisors can work with caseworkers on meeting the minimum requirements of this policy (see attachment). BPP staff also created a Q & A document (see attachment) that will be provided as a reference to counties in Quarter 6 through Area Administration staff. BPP staff also worked with the Child Welfare Training Partnership via the Curriculum Committee to update courses to increase the effectiveness of caseworker/family visits.

Specifically, the policy will be incorporated into the foundation training in Case Assessment and Planning.

19. Foster Parent Support Plans (K.1)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee developed a Numbered Memo (see attachment) that explains the current statutory requirement for including information in a child's permanency plan about the service and support needs of the child, the birth parents, and the foster parents and provides direction as to where that information should be documented in the permanency plan. In addition, the memo provides examples of foster parent support plans if an agency chooses to utilize support plans with their foster homes. These support plans are in the process of being published and will be posted to the DHFS internet site. The memo will continue through the DCFS approval process once the support plan forms are finalized.

20. Instrument to Assist in Assessing a Foster Child's Needs (K.2)

The Out-of-Home Care Committee has been working on revisions to the existing Information to Foster Parents, Part B form (see attachment), to organize the current information on the form in a more logical manner and add additional information relevant for a foster parent to care for a child. This existing form is designed to provide information to foster parents so they can provide appropriate care to the child and the form is completed as soon as possible when the child is placed in the foster home and no later than within 30 days of the placement. This form is mandatory for every child entering out-of-home care.

The committee has taken the form and reformatted the existing indicators to reflect specific topic areas. Existing indicators have also been updated, more indicators for young children have been included, and mental health indicators have been added. The revised form is designed so that if an agency checks many indicators in one category, it will inform the agency about the specific areas in which a child may need additional assessment. Committee members favored the revision of the existing form rather than a new assessment form because case workers would have difficulty conducting separate formal assessments due to workload issues and lack of expertise in specific assessment topic areas and protocols.

The last page of the form also includes emergency or crisis contact information specific to the child, including the child's behaviors that may lead to health or safety concerns, warning indicators of a developing crisis, steps to take in responding to an emergency or crisis, information about interventions that have previously worked with the child, and agency reporting requirements and debriefing procedures. This recommendation incorporates PEP Item C.4 relating to emergency response plans, so Item C.4 is deleted as a separate task in the PEP Matrix. The draft form will be posted to the Bulletin Board in February and comments will be reviewed by committee members at the March meeting.

21. Foster Parent Pre-Service and Ongoing Training (K.4)

The Foster Parent Training Committee of the Child Welfare Training Council has drafted a report (see attachment) describing the results of a survey of child welfare agencies across the state to

determine the current availability of foster parent training, both pre-service and ongoing. This report was presented to the Training Council at the end of January. The Training Council will discuss the recommendations included in the report at the next meeting in March 2006.

The Foster Parent Training Committee is also currently reviewing the competencies that should be included in foster parent training. DCFS staff have begun revisions to the existing numbered memo that allows agencies to apply for Title IV-E pass-through funding to support foster parent training to reflect the recommendations of this committee.

22. Foster Parent Handbook (K.5)

The Foster Care and Adoption Resource Center is currently in the process of soliciting edits on their first draft of a Wisconsin Foster Parent Handbook from a statewide workgroup that includes foster parents, foster care coordinators from the BMCW and counties, and BPP staff. The first draft of the Handbook was created from a composite of national and local handbooks. Edits from workgroup members are due back to Resource Center staff at the end of February. For specific topics areas such as the Indian Child Welfare Act and expectations of court processes or Guardians ad Litem, Resource Center staff are asking specific statewide experts to either provide suggested language or review proposed language.

23. BMCW Managed Care (L.1)

During Quarter 5, the BMCW and the Division of Health Care Financing (DHCF) continued to work with the vendor, ABRI Health Care, to implement the managed care organization. Roles and responsibilities of the Health Care Manager (HCM) have been defined. Implementation of the managed care program and enrollment of foster children is expected in April 2006.

There have been several changes to the original Medicaid waiver for the program, so the DHCF is required to submit an amended waiver to the federal authorities at the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). CMS must approve the amended waiver request before implementation of the program. If the amended waiver is not approved and DHCF must engage in negotiations, implementation of the program may be delayed beyond April 2006.

Changes to the program in the amended waiver include:

- Waiver Period. The waiver was originally approved from June 2004 through June 2006. Based on the current implementation timeline, DHCF is requesting an extension through February 29, 2008. DHCF does not expect this to be an issue of concern for CMS.
- Contiguous Counties. The advisory committee has recommended that children in BMCW custody who are placed in a contiguous county remain eligible for the managed care program. DHCF does not expect this to be an issue of concern for CMS.
- Health Care Managers. The advisory committee has also recommended several changes to the rate methodology, and those must also be approved by CMS. One of those changes, an add-on to the rate for the health care manager, has been questioned by CMS.

The training curriculum is being developed and BMCW staff will be trained on the program in Quarter 6 for implementation in April 2006. The caseload ratio and professional requirements required for the Health Care Managers is being developed and will be finalized during Quarter 6.

24. Mental Health Screening (M.1)

The Department of Health and Family Service (DHFS) internal workgroup to address mental health screening, assessments and treatment in child welfare has met several times and continues to edit California's version of a mental health screening tool for use with children and adults in the CPS system. The screening tool is designed for use by CPS workers to identify persons who need further mental health assessment. The workgroup developed an issue paper (see attachment) and is consulting with stakeholders for feedback on aspects of capacity improvement.

The workgroup is preparing for implementation of a Wisconsin version of the screening tool on a pilot basis and is developing an Informational Memo describing the purpose of the screening tool pilot program and requesting the voluntary participation of counties or tribes in the pilot program. A draft of the memo should be completed for review by the various DHFS Divisions in March 2006. The pilot program is planned to begin in Quarter 6 and will assist in determining how the screening tools can be used for child welfare purposes. Based on the results of the pilot program, the screening tools will be made available for statewide use.

The workgroup would like to pilot the screening tool in counties/tribes with members on the Child Welfare Case Process Committee. If more participation from counties/tribes is necessary to get a large enough sample, the workgroup will approach the Wisconsin County Human Services Association for additional volunteers. To facilitate implementation of pilots, the Division of Disability and Elder Services is willing to commit \$28,000 of Mental Health Block Grant funding to be used prior to June 30, 2007.

The following are criteria that will be used for selection of pilot agencies:

- A willingness to participate in the pilot program;
- A willingness to be a part of the evaluation process for the screening tools;
- An established child welfare and mental health partnership;
- An infrastructure that can provide full assessment and treatment services, (i.e. Community Services Teams (CST), Integrated Services Projects (ISP), etc.); and
- Agency mental health staff who are informed about trauma and trained to treat children.

25. Reasonable Efforts and Permanency Planning Rule HFS 44 (N.1)

The HFS 44 Workgroup was re-established in January 2006 and met again in February. A meeting is scheduled in March, after which the draft of Ch. HFS 44 Adm. Code will be posted to the PEP Bulletin Board for public comment. The workgroup will meet a final time in April 2006 to review comments received from the Bulletin Board and make final changes. In May 2006, the draft will then be submitted to the DHFS Administrative Rule Coordinator to continue the rulemaking process and submit the rule for legislative approval. The effective date of the rule, currently planned for Quarter 8, will be contingent on final legislative approval of the administrative rule.

26. Concurrent Planning Timelines (O.1 and O.1.3)

The DCFS issued Information Memo 2005-12 on December 7, 2005 (see attachment) to provide guidance on concurrent permanency planning. The Continuous Permanency Planning Timeline document serves as a guide for meeting legal timelines, initiating referrals, enhancing communication, identifying concurrent planning benchmarks, and coordinating activities to ensure timely permanence for children. The document identifies the recommended roles of the county or tribal case manager, the state permanency consultant, and the adoption worker and the tasks that may be performed in each role to help achieve permanence for children.

27. Concurrent Planning Training (O.3.2)

Training provided by State Permanency Consultants to county child welfare supervisors was completed in December 2005. Follow up technical assistance is being provided by the State Permanency Consultants during regular visits to the county human/social service agencies.

28. Analyze TPR Case Processing (O.4)

Through the Children's Court Initiative (CCI), DCFS is working with the Director of State Courts Office (DSCO) to analyze how Termination of Parental Rights (TPR) cases are being processed. The sample of cases examined in the county CCI reviews includes TPR cases and based on the county review information, DSCO will be able to identify local and statewide trends that affect the timeliness of TPR case processing. The DCFS and DSCO will work jointly to analyze trends and identify steps that can be taken to improve timeliness.

29. Role of Foster Parents and Custodians in Court Hearings and Permanency Reviews (P.1)

The benchmark task for this item were rephrased due to input from Out-of-Home Care Committee members that the committee does not have the authority to direct the court system to take specific action. The revised task is to clarify the rights and opportunities of foster parents and other physical custodians at court hearings and permanency plan reviews.

The Out-of-Home Care Committee drafted an Informational Memo (see attachment) that explains the right of foster parents and other physical custodians to receive notice of permanency plan reviews and court hearings specific to the child in their care (except hearings for which notice need only be provided to a child and his/her counsel). The memo clarifies the opportunity for foster parents to provide information to the court and provides a format to help foster parents consider what written information they may want to provide to the court specific to the permanency plan review or court hearing. The memo also clarifies that foster parents are not considered a party to permanency plan reviews and court hearings and emphasizes that any information a foster parent submits to the court is distributed to all parties in a case. The draft memo and format will be posted to the Bulletin Board in February and comments will be reviewed by committee members at the March meeting.

30. Foster Parent Survey (P.3)

As a part of the joint reviews conducted by the Continuous Quality Improvement (CQI) program and Children's Court Initiative (CCI), the two review teams are conducting joint focus groups with foster parents in lieu of a survey. In addition to the focus groups, the CCI review process includes observation of court proceedings and viewing court case records that provides information about how the local court functions related to foster parent hearing notices, attendance, and an opportunity to be heard. The information from focus groups, file reviews, and observation provides the court and agency with specific and current feedback on how foster parents are included in the court process.

31. Pre-Service Training for Child Welfare Caseworkers and Supervisors (R.1)

The DCFS has completed the statement of scope (see attachment) for what will become Ch. HFS 43, Administrative Code, regarding requirements for child welfare staff training. The statement of scope was approved by the DHFS Office of Legal Counsel and the first draft of the administrative rule has been forwarded to OLC for approval. It is anticipated that the rule will be promulgated by September of 2006 barring any unforeseen obstacles. This is one quarter later than the original timeframe of July 2006 and the PEP Matrix has been updated accordingly.

The content of the Child Welfare Pre-Service Training Modules have been completed and have all been forwarded to the University of Wisconsin-Madison Division of Information Technology for packaging into distance learning technology. It is anticipated that the modules will be finished and available for piloting by May 2006 prior to becoming required in September.

32. eWiSACWIS Training Committee (R.3)

The eWiSACWIS Training Committee held its first meeting in December 2005. The group refined the committee charge to include the task of studying the continuum of training needs as they relate to eWiSACWIS in Wisconsin and making recommendations to the Child Welfare Training Council. The committee will also study and make recommendations on the involvement of the Wisconsin Child Welfare Training System in ongoing eWiSACWIS refresher training for workers and supervisors.

After initial approval by the Training Council on overarching issues, the eWiSACWIS ad hoc committee will make written and verbal reports to the Training Council through the committee co-chairs. The committee is co-chaired by the Milwaukee Training Partnership Director and the eWiSACWIS Project Coordinator. The membership of the Ad Hoc Committee includes:

- 2 representatives from each training partnership
- 2 training managers or training directors
- 2 representatives from the eWiSACWIS project
- 2 representatives from DCFS
- Others may voluntarily participate

33. Service Array Survey (T.1)

During Quarter 5, the Service Array Workgroup, comprised of nine counties, BMCW and Area Administration, continued to hold meetings related to the development of the service array survey. The survey is being developed to identify gaps in the range of services needed for safety and permanency throughout Wisconsin. With assistance from the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, the workgroup agreed upon 83 service descriptions to include in the survey. In addition, the workgroup developed survey questions based on the service descriptions, identifying the availability, importance, accessibility and funding sources for the 83 services. A draft DCFS Numbered Memo (see attachment) describing the survey was sent by DCFS for WCHSA review in early February. It is anticipated that the memo will be issued to counties in early March 2006. Data obtained from the counties will be entered via the web, with a due date for completed surveys of April 3, 2006. The Service Array Workgroup will meet in Quarter 6 to review and analyze the survey data.

34. Workload Survey (T.2)

County representatives from the Service Array Workgroup have agreed to participate in discussions regarding the potential development of a Workload Management Survey. This group had its first opportunity to discuss the Workload Survey in January 2006. Three options for a workload management survey were shared with members of the workgroup. These options outlined variances in effort needed by counties and DCFS to complete a workload survey. Further discussion, including assistance from the National Child Welfare Resource Center for Organizational Improvement, will occur in Quarter 6. Continued discussions will focus on which of the three options the workgroup will recommend and development of the survey will follow.

PEP Data Update

The data required for the PEP includes information on state performance relative to national standards relating to safety and permanency as well as progress on the CFSR case review outcome items for which Wisconsin established improvement targets.

The PEP data will come from several sources, including eWISACWIS reports specifically designed for PEP performance measurement, eWISACWIS data submitted for federal AFCARS and NCANDS purposes, results from the state CQI case reviews, and other data collection methods.

1. Status of NCANDS and AFCARS Reporting

DCFS will submit its first NCANDS Child and Agency Files for the FFY 2005 reporting period on March 30, 2006. DCFS will continue to work with the federal NCANDS contractor (Walter R. McDonald and Associates) to address questions related to submission of the NCANDS files. DCFS has completed development of an eWiSACWIS Initial Assessment data quality report to monitor and address data quality issues for NCANDS purposes and CPS practice issues regarding completion of Initial Assessments. This report was put into production in February 2006 and is available to all counties and the BMCW via eWReports.

Wisconsin continues to improve the quality of the AFCARS Foster Care data. The DCFS has continued to identify and address data quality issues associated with recent FFY submissions, particularly those affecting the Time to Adoption outcome measure calculation, and plans to re-submit AFCARS Foster Care files for FFY 2004 and possibly for FFY 2005. These resubmissions will be made prior to the end of the PEP period. In addition, the DCFS issued the improved AFCARS Error Reports for both Foster Care and Adoption data elements on January 2006. Improvements to these reports included presenting the report output in a more user-friendly, ready-to-use format for local agency managers, supervisors and staff.

Finally, to improve AFCARS data quality and state and federal calculations of state performance on the permanency standards and permanency-related outcomes, the DCFS will begin statewide roll-out use of the new Placement History Correction functionality in the first half of CY 2006.

2. State Performance on National Standards

The state baselines for the PEP are based on the FFY 2003 AFCARS annual file for the permanency national standards and state CY 2003 data for the safety national standards. The minimum improvement targets were agreed to as part of federal approval of the PEP and must be achieved by the end of the two-year PEP period.

Table 1 includes data showing state performance on the national standards for safety and permanency. The data in Table 1 is the same as the data submitted in the Quarter 4 report. DCFS will use updated CY 2005 state data for the safety items and FFY 2005 AFCARS data (FFY 2005 AB and C files) for the permanency items in the Quarter 6 report.

The DCFS confirmed in a January 3, 2006 conference call with federal ACF staff, including the Children's Bureau data team, that state safety will continue to be used for measurement of state achievement on the safety national standards for the duration of the PEP period. While the NCANDS child file for FFY 2005 will be available, switching from the state data to the NCANDS data during the PEP period would create data transition issues. The DCFS submitted descriptions of the state data using the Children's Bureau format and obtained approval on February 13, 2006.

DCFS will continue to use state eWiSACWIS reports designed based on the national standards to monitor progress. These reports have been incorporated into the eWiSACWIS Reports Dashboard in a graphical format and have been well received by counties.

3. Analysis of State Performance on National Standards

Safety Outcomes

Recurrence of Maltreatment - The DCFS uses an eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report to monitor performance for this standard. The report indicates a maltreatment recurrence rate of 5.25% for CY 2004 and 4.97% for preliminary CY 2005 data through June 2005.

Maltreatment in Out-of-Home Care – The DCFS uses an eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Report to monitor performance for this item. The report indicates a maltreatment in OHC rate of 0.57% for CY 2004 and 0.62% for preliminary 2005 data through June 2005. Performance for this standard reflects the year-to-year fluctuations that occur with this measure. DCFS continues to review lists of the actual cases for CY 2004 and CY 2005 to ensure that the relationship of the maltreater (foster parent or facility staff) is reported correctly, which may result in re-calculation of state performance on this standard.

Permanency Outcomes

The performance for the four permanency national standards is based on the recent permanency profile for Wisconsin generated by ACF from AFCARS data using the FFY 2004B file (4/04 – 9/04) and the FFY 2005A file (10/04 – 3/05) to create a “2005 BA” annualized file. DCFS is working with ACF to replicate the permanency profile at the state level and compare the federal performance calculations with the results of the eWiSACWIS Federal Outcome Reports for the four permanency national standards. Updated results for FFY 2005 (10/04 – 9/05) will be added once the state data profile is received from the Children's Bureau data team.

The DCFS understands that data submitted to AFCARS for some children continues to result in data being excluded from the performance calculations. To better understand the impact of excluding cases in the federal calculations and the discrepancies between the AFCARS-based permanency data profile and comparable state eWiSACWIS reports, DCFS began a review of the files from ACF to examine exclude records. The results of this review will assist DCFS in determining whether to resubmit AFCARS files for the FFY 2004 and 2005 periods.

Table 1 - Wisconsin Achievement of National Performance Standards

Performance Standards	National Standard (Percent)	WI Data 2002 (Percent)	WI Data 2003 (Percent)	Minimum Improvement Target (Percent)	WI Data 2004 (Percent)	WI Data 2005 (Preliminary) (Percent)
Safety Outcome 1 – Recurrence of Maltreatment Of all children who were victims of substantiated maltreatment reports, what percent were victims of another substantiated report within a 6-month period?	6.1 or less	6.04	7.13	6.23	5.25	4.97
Safety Outcome 2 – Maltreatment While in Care Of all children in out-of-home care, what percent experienced maltreatment by foster parents or facility staff members?	0.57 or less	0.26	0.30	Standard Met	0.57	0.62
Permanency Outcome 1 – Re-entry to Care Of all children who entered out-of-home care, what percent re-entered care within 12 months of a prior out-of-home care episode?	8.6 or less	22.2	21.5	20.15	18.9	21.5
Permanency Outcome 2 – Timely Reunification Of all children reunified from out-of-home care, what percent were reunified within 12 months of entry into out-of-home care?	76.2 or more	66.5	65.2	67.62	70.1	79.8
Permanency Outcome 3 – Timely Adoption Of all children adopted from out-of-homecare , what percent were adopted within 24 months of their entry into care?	32.0 or more	17.5	17.8	20.7	21.7	31.1*
Permanency Outcome 4 – Placement Stability Of all children in out-of-home care for less than 12 months, what percent experienced no more than 2 placement settings?	86.7 or more	92.3	92.6	Standard Met	90.5	90.7

Data Sources:

-- Safety Outcomes- 2002-2003 data are based on estimates derived from alternate methodology approved by the federal Children's Bureau; the 2004 & preliminary 2005 figures are derived solely from eWiSACWIS Maltreatment Recurrence and Maltreatment in Out of Home Care Outcome reports.

-- Permanency Outcomes- 2002-2004 and preliminary 2005 data are based on data profile figures generated by the federal Children's Bureau using the state's FFY AFCARS submissions; preliminary 2005 data is based on AFCARS files from the 2004B and 2005A reporting periods.

* Time to Adoption Data from the federal State Data Profile includes adoptions with incorrect removal dates; efforts to correct removal dates will be completed by September 2006

Timely Adoption - The DCFS has identified and corrected inaccurate removal data for many cases in both FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 periods. In September 2005, the DCFS made the necessary corrections to these removal dates by Adoption Program staff using the eWiSACWIS placement history correction functionality. DCFS is still reviewing the completeness of adoption reporting in the AFCARS files for FFY 2004 and FFY 2005 prior to resubmission of the files.

Timely Reunification, Re-entry and Placement Stability – The DCFS will make any necessary revisions to state performance based on the new data profile resulting from the above-mentioned AFCARS Foster Care file re-submissions.

Adjustments to State Baselines for National Standards

At this point, Wisconsin does not propose adjustments to the state baseline performance levels used to compute performance improvement targets for the national standards. Adjustments may be warranted for the timeliness to adoption and maltreatment in out-of-home care measures, but additional data clean-up activity, data analysis, and submittal to the Children's Bureau for review is needed before determining if any of the performance standard baselines should be adjusted.

4. State Performance on CFSR Items

Table 2 shows the state performance on 14 of the 19 CFSR performance items that Wisconsin is required to address in the PEP. For five of the 19 items, performance is measured using the statewide data for the national standard applicable to the item rather than case review data. These items are shown in Table 1. Case review data is used for 13 of the 19 items based on the results of county case reviews through the CQI process. For the item on CPS Investigation Timeliness, statewide data from eWiSACWIS is used to measure performance, as described in the next section on PEP performance reports.

Case review data is also shown for the four CFSR items that Wisconsin was found in conformance on during the August 2003 CFSR. This data is presented for information purposes only as these items are not addressed in the PEP.

The data presented in this report consists of information from 44 cases reviewed in four counties during the period of September 2005 through January 2006. The counties include Washington, Rock, Waukesha and Iowa. The data is computed using scores from the QSR case reviews and the QSR/CFSR conversion methodology approved by the federal ACF in January 2006. The 44 cases included 26 out-of-home placement cases and 18 in-home service cases.

For some of the CFSR performance items, particularly Item 10, the number of cases reviewed thus far is very small and thus the performance data is very tentative at this point. As additional cases are reviewed in subsequent county reviews, the reliability of the performance data will improve. If necessary, case samples for county reviews will be stratified to provide a sufficient number of cases for these items. For Items 11 and 14, additional analysis is needed to complete the conversion of QSR information into the CFSR equivalent scores.

As specified in the federal ACF approval of the PEP, Wisconsin must demonstrate a 2% improvement for the 14 items that case review or eWiSACWIS data is used. The improvement targets for the five CFSR items tied to National Standards are shown in Table 1. For Safety Items 1 and 3 and Well Being Items 17, 18 and 20, Wisconsin must achieve the 2% improvement to avoid federal financial penalties on those items. The improvement targets for the national standards must also be achieved to avoid financial penalties.

The results for the 13 items based on the QSR case reviews shows that thus far Wisconsin is generally meeting the improvement targets. For three of the 13 items, the results show Wisconsin is below the improvement target. The result for Item 20 is very close to the improvement target and the number of cases for Item 10 is too small to provide reliable information at this point. The results for Item 7, Permanency Goals, is well below the improvement target at this point and will be watched closely in subsequent reviews to analyze the factors affecting performance on this item.

Table 2 – State Performance on CFSR Outcome Items

Item #	Item Description	Initial Baseline	Adjusted Baseline	Quarter 5 Performance	Improvement Target
Safety Outcome 1 & 2 Performance Items					
1 *	Timeliness of CPS investigations	N/A	44.80%	48.20%	46.80%
2 *	Recurrence of maltreatment	7.13%	National Standard	National Standard	6.23%
3 *	Services to prevent removal	84%	79%	88.6%	81%
4	Risk of harm to child	86%	N/A	95.5%	N/A
Permanency Outcome 1 Performance Items					
5 *	Re-entry to out-of-home care	21.50%	National Standard	National Standard	20.15%
6 *	Stability of out-of-home care placements	86.70%	National Standard	National Standard	Maintain 86.7%
7	Permanency goal for child	60%	64%	36.0%	66%
8 *	Reunification, guardianship, and placement with relatives	65.20%	National Standard	National Standard	67.60%
9 *	Adoption	17.80%	National Standard	National Standard	20.70%
10	Other planned living arrangement	83%	70%	40% (n = 5)	72%
Permanency Outcome 2 Performance Items					
11	Placement proximity	100%	N/A	Data Incomplete	N/A
12	Placement with siblings	50%	59%	100.0%	61%
13	Visiting with parents and siblings in out-of-home care	54%	61%	65.2%	63%
14	Preserving connections	63%	68%	Data Incomplete	70%
15	Relative placement	65%	53%	84.0%	55%
16	Relationship of child in care with parents	63%	67%	70.8%	69%
Well-Being Outcome 1 Performance Items					
17 *	Needs/services of child, parents, and foster parents	58%	56%	75.0%	58%
18 *	Child/family involvement in case planning	62%	56%	65.9%	58%
19	Worker visits with child	88%	N/A	92.3%	N/A
20 *	Worker visits with parents	77%	72%	72.7%	74%

Item #	Item Description	Initial Baseline	Adjusted Baseline	Quarter 5 Performance	Improvement Target
Well Being Outcomes 2 and 3 Performance Items					
21	Educational needs of child	91%	N/A	86.0%	N/A
22	Physical health of child	83%	87%	100.0%	89%
23	Mental health of child	69%	71%	82.2%	73%

	Performance Target met thus far
	Performance Target not met thus far
	Item measured using National Standard or not applicable for PEP
*	Item subject to federal penalties if fail to meet Performance Target

5. PEP eWiSACWIS Performance Reports

The performance reports used for the PEP include a set of Federal Outcome Reports that replicate the national performance standards for safety and permanency using data directly from eWiSACWIS rather than the AFCARS and NCANDS files. Also users are PEP Performance Reports to measure the impact of PEP Action Steps for several safety, permanency and well being outcome items.

Permanency Planning Report (D.6) - The report on permanency plan goals for PEP Action Step D and CFSR Item 7 was completed in Quarter 5 and made available to counties in January 2006. The report (see attached design guide) displays summary and case detail information on permanency plans and permanency plan reviews and hearings for all children that are currently in placement in the report period. Summary results are provided for the completion of permanency plans and plan reviews based on the length of placement episodes to assist counties in monitoring the timeliness of developing and reviewing permanency plans. Child specific detail data is also provided for each child that is included in the summary results to allow for further data analysis at the local level. The report will be used to monitor the status of permanency planning efforts and goal setting statewide. The report also indicates the current permanency goals for children in placement and changes to permanency goals over time. Like other PEP Reports, this report is available to counties through eWReports and will be run on a monthly, quarterly and annual basis.

eWiSACWIS Reports – The DCFS continues to work with the BMCW and county agencies to fine tune the reports used to provide information for the PEP. The DCFS has implemented a plan to provide ongoing communication and technical assistance to local agency staff and to include agency staff in the report enhancement design and testing process. In Quarter 5, DCFS trained Area Administration staff to use the PEP reports with counties in their region. Improvements were made to the case detail

worksheets in December 2005 to facilitate the use of the worksheets to help counties identify cases with incomplete or inaccurate information that affects individual county performance.

The PEP Reports address the following performance measures as either a primary or secondary data source as follows:

PEP Performance Measure	PEP Report Name	Primary Performance Data Source	Secondary Performance Data Source
Safety			
Timeliness of CPS Initial Assessments	CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness	PEP Report	N/A
Safety Assessments, Plans and Services	CPS Safety	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Permanency			
Timeliness of ASFA Documentation	ASFA Documentation	PEP Report	Case Review Results
Completeness of ICWA Notification	ICWA Notification	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Sibling Placement	Siblings in Placement	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Permanency Planning	Permanency Planning Detail	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Independent Living Assessment and Planning	Independent Living	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Well Being			
Timeliness of Family Assessments & Case Planning	Family Assessments and Case Plans	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Monthly Contacts for Ongoing Cases	Contacts with Children and Parents	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Education Screen for Ongoing Cases	Education Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report
Use of Medical/MH Screen for Ongoing Cases	Medical Screen	Case Review Results	PEP Report

6. Data Entry for PEP Reports

The DCFS issued Information Memo 2006-06 on January 23, 2006 (see attachment) that identifies critical documentation in eWiSACWIS related to data used in the above-mentioned PEP reports developed to measure child welfare program performance. The memo identifies key data elements and the system windows the elements are located on.

Additional efforts have been made to improve the quality and accuracy of documentation in eWiSACWIS related to the PEP and Outcome reports during Quarter 5. These efforts include the following enhancements to eWiSACWIS reports and report functionality:

- Added new functionality to the eWReports Federal Dashboard to create and download data tables and graphs; and
- Added a new tab to PEP and Federal Outcome Reports case detail output to provide a simple case listing tab to more easily identify those cases included in a given report.

7. CPS Timeliness Report

This report is used as the primary data source for CFSR Safety Item 1 relating to timeliness of CPS investigations. The report uses eWiSACWIS data on completed CPS Initial Assessments, including the date the CPS report was received, the assigned response time, and when the initial face-to-face contact with the children involved in the CPS report was attempted or occurred. Timeliness is measured based on the percentage of valid CPS reports where the face-to-face contact occurred within the assigned response time. Response times can vary from 0-2 hours for high priority CPS reports to 2-5 days for low priority CPS reports.

Table 3 shows data from Quarters 2 through 4 of CY 2005 and the baseline period of Quarter 4 of CY 2004 and Quarter 1 of CY 2005. The baseline performance level of 44.8% was approved by the federal ACF in January 2006. Based on the results for CY 2005 Quarters 2 through 4, the state is making improvement in performance for this item and will meet the performance improvement target.

Only cases where initial contact documentation is entered properly and with valid time intervals are used in the calculation to determine the timeliness of the initial face-to-face contact. As identified in the attached chart, a significant number of the records for each reporting period do not have the initial contact date entered properly or have records excluded due to invalid time interval calculations resulting from data entry errors associated with the report date/time or the initial contact date/time. The DCFS continues to provide assistance to agencies regarding how to properly enter information into eWiSACWIS. A new eWiSACWIS report identifying data entry errors, omissions, and timeliness problems was released in January 2006. In addition, the recently issued Access Standards and the resulting changes to eWiSACWIS functionality to take place in March 2006 will provide additional opportunities to provide technical assistance and further emphasis on the quality and accuracy of Initial Assessment documentation.

Table 3 - CPS Initial Assessment Timeliness

BASELINE PERFORMANCE LEVEL

Q4 of 2004	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Total
<i>Percentage w/in Response Time</i>	39.4%	42.3%	27.1%	47.7%	NA	43.0%

Q1 of 2005	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Total
<i>Percentage w/in Response Time</i>	69.6%	45.3%	34.2%	49.0%	NA	46.5%

Baseline Performance Level						Grand Total
<i>Percentage w/in Response Time</i>						44.8%

PERFORMANCE MONITORING RESULTS

Q2 OF 2005	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Total
Total Records	291	1,914	1,347	4,896	67	8,515
Total Records Valid *	151	638	911	3,148	NA	4,848
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	51.9%	33.3%	67.6%	64.3%	NA	56.9%
Sub-Total within Response Time	106	325	335	1,538	NA	2,304
Sub-Total outside Response Time	45	313	576	1,610	NA	2,544
<i>Percentage w/in Response Time</i>	70.2%	50.9%	36.8%	48.9%	NA	47.5%

Q3 of 2005	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Total
Total Records	245	1,183	1,212	4,415	115	7,170
Total Records Valid *	129	569	819	2,882	NA	4,399
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	52.7%	48.1%	67.6%	65.3%	NA	61.4%
Sub-Total within Response Time	96	239	277	1,469	NA	2,081
Sub-Total outside Response Time	33	330	542	1,413	NA	2,318
<i>Percentage w/in Response Time</i>	74.4%	42.0%	33.8%	51.0%	NA	47.3%

Q4 of 2005	0-2 Hrs	Same Day	24 Hrs	2-5 Days	N/A	Grand Total
Total Records	235	1,082	1,106	4,087	63	6,573
Total Records Valid *	119	481	735	2,657	NA	3,992
<i>Percentage of Valid Records</i>	50.6%	44.5%	66.5%	65.0%	NA	60.7%
Sub-Total within Response Time	89	228	283	1,326	NA	1,926
Sub-Total outside Response Time	30	253	452	1,331	NA	2,066
<i>Percentage w/in Response Time</i>	74.8%	47.4%	38.5%	49.9%	NA	48.2%

* Valid records include those records where contact information is documented as required, is not a negative ('-') number, and is not greater than 99 days.

Changes to PEP Matrix

The following changes were made to the PEP Matrix reflecting activity through the end of Quarter 5. See the updated Matrix attached to this report for more information on modifications to tasks in the Matrix. The changes made in this report reflect clarification of tasks and incremental changes to completion dates. The completion dates may be further revised depending on the outcome of renegotiation of PEP tasks with the federal ACF in March 2006.

A.2 – Multiple Reports/Allegations: The Maltreatment and Maltreater determinations policy under A.2.b will be issued via DCFS Memo in Quarter 6 rather than Quarter 5.

B.1 - Safety Intervention Standards: The Safety Intervention Standards will be issued under B.1.b in Quarter 6 rather than Quarter 5. The changes to eWiSACWIS under B.1.c will be completed in Quarter 7 as part of the June 2006 maintenance release. The technical assistance under B.1.d will take place during Quarter 6 and 7.

C.1.b – Trial Home Visits: The Trial Home Visit policy will be completed in Q6 and issued via DCFS Memo in Quarter 7. The Trial Home Visit policy will be incorporated into training courses in Quarter 8.

C.1. and C.2 - Re-entry and Placement Stability Analysis. The analysis of both factors was completed in Quarter 5. Developing program responses to the analysis will take place during Quarter 6 along with technical assistance or system reporting instructions.

C.3 – Placement Manual: The manual was updated in Quarter 5 and will continue to be updated annually.

C.4 – Emergency Response Plan: This item was incorporated in the revision of the Information for Foster Parents Form under Task K.2

E.1 and E.2 – Sibling Placement: The changes clarify eWiSACWIS reporting direction was provided in Quarter 5 and guidance on use of exceptional rates was provided through the DCFS memo issued in Quarter 5, as shown in the new task E.1.b2. Technical assistance will be provided in Quarter 6-7.

F.1.a – Visitation and Interaction Policy: The policy will be incorporated into ongoing training in Quarter 6.

F.2 – ICWA Notification: The DCFS memo on the use of the previously issued eWiSACWIS ICWA notification templates was issued in Quarter 5. ICWA notification was addressed in the ICWA training curriculum and in follow up with counties and tribes in Quarter 4 also.

G.1 - ICWA Requirements: Task G.1.b2 was added to indicate that DCFS is seeking the drafting of state ICWA legislation in Quarter 6 for consideration in the 2006 legislative

session. Issuance of the memo under G.1.a2 will be delayed to quarter 6 to seek if the legislation is introduced. Task G.1.d relating to eWiSACWIS templates was addressed under task F.2.2

H.1 - Family Member Identification: The title of this task is changed to focus on family member identification. The order of benchmark tasks is revised to put the tasks in sequence.

H.2 – Sharing Information: Task H.2.5 was added to indicate that DCFS is seeking legislative consideration of language to allow information to be shared more broadly. Issuance of the memo under H.2.3 will be delayed to Quarter 6 to seek if the legislation is approved

H.4 – Relative Placement Survey: Information on use of relative placements will be collected through focus groups as part of the county QSR reviews rather than through a survey. The focus groups started in Quarter 5 and information will be analyzed starting in Quarter 6.

I.1- Non-Custodial Parents: Task I.1.4 is revised to address expanding access to the KIDS child support information system to locate parents rather than direct access to the Federal Parent Locator System

J.3 - Barriers to Engagement: Tasks J.3.b and J.3.c are clarified and the training and technical assistance will begin in Quarter 6.

K.1 – Services to Foster Parents: recommendations for foster parent support plans were made in Quarter 5 and will be addressed in training beginning in Quarter 6.

K.2. – Foster Child Assessment: This task was changed to focus on revising the information to foster parents form which provides detailed information about foster children. Task k.2.a.2 was added to clarify when the revised form will be issued.

K.4 – Foster Parent Training: The foster parent training committee of the Child Welfare Training Council was formed in Quarter 4 and the training survey was completed in Quarter 5. The assessment of training capacity will continue in Quarter 6 with resource needs identified in Quarter 7. Tasks K.4.a.2, 3, 4 and 6 are renumbered to put in the proper sequence. Task K.4.a.5 is deleted as this is addressed by task k.4.b.6. The completion date for task K.4.b is changed to Quarter 7 and task K.4.b.5 is deleted as the need for rule changes is covered under the renumbered task K.4.a.5.

L.1 and L.2 – Managed Care Program: The implementation date for the managed care program is changed to Quarter 6 (target is April 2006). The dates for reviewing data under L.1.c and L.2.1 are changed to reflect the delayed implementation.

M.1 – Mental Health Screening: The pilots for the screening tool under M.1.c will begin in Quarter 7. The dates for subsequent tasks M.1.d through f are changed to Quarter 8.

N.1. – Ch. HFS 44: The order of benchmark tasks N.1.1 and N.1.2 is changed to put in the proper sequence. The completion date for possible changes to eWiSACWIS under N.1.5 is changed to Quarter 8.

P.1 – Foster Parent/Custodian Input Process: The task is changed to focus on steps that can be taken by DCFS and the Out-of-Home Care Committee. Tasks P1.1 and P.1.2 are created to clarify the actions that will be taken. The guidance on the input process will be issued in Quarter 6.

P.3 – Measurement of Input: The task is revised to indicate that a survey was explored. Information from focus groups conducted during county reviews will be used to determine improvement in the input process.

Q.4 – BMCW Comprehensive Review: The task completion dates are revised to reflect that the review was completed in January 2006. The integration of data will occur in Quarter 6 and the inclusion of BMCW in the statewide QSR case review process will begin in Quarter 7.

Q.6 – QA Reports: The task is clarified to refer to reports from eWiSACWIS. Task Q.6.4 is moved to Q.3 as task Q.3.9 because it pertains to the use of information from the county reviews.

R.1.c.- Staff Training Administrative Rule: The rule will be submitted for DHFS Office of Legal Counsel review in Quarter 6 and the draft will be circulated in Quarter 6 also. Public hearings on the rule will be held in Quarter 7 and the rule is expected to be issued by Quarter 8

R.3– eWiSACWIS Training Committee – The committee was formed in Quarter 5. Activities to integrate eWiSACWIS and practice training will start in Quarter 6. Task R.3.c is renumbered as R.3.b.

T.1- Service Array Survey: The workgroup was formed at the beginning of Quarter 5. The survey will be conducted during Quarter 6 with the results available at the end of Quarter 6 for analysis. Use of the survey results under task T.1.b will begin in Quarter 7.

T.2 – Workload Management Survey: The workgroup began discussing the survey at the end of Quarter 5. Development of the survey will be done in Quarter 6 as scheduled with the survey conducted in Quarter 7. Task T.2.b was deleted as duplicative because the workgroup will address both staff and supervisor workloads. Task T.2.c is renumbered as T.2.b and the caseload ratios will be developed in Quarter 8.